

**From:** [ANDERSON Jim M](#)  
**To:** [Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#)  
**Cc:** [LACEY David](#); [MCCLINCY Matt](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Revised RPAC Letter  
**Date:** 11/21/2008 12:11 PM

---

I can't speak for Matt since he's out..., but we'll try.

Jim

-----Original Message-----

From: Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov  
[mailto:Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov]  
Sent: Friday, November 21, 2008 11:01 AM  
To: ANDERSON Jim M  
Subject: RE: Revised RPAC Letter

Can you guys get back to me by COB Monday?

Eric

"ANDERSON Jim M"  
<ANDERSON.Jim@de  
q.state.or.us>

11/21/2008 10:54  
AM

To  
Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,  
"MCCLINCY Matt"  
<MCCLINCY.Matt@deq.state.or.us>,  
"LACEY David"  
<LACEY.David@deq.state.or.us>  
CC  
Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,  
Kristine Koch/R10/USEPA/US@EPA  
Subject  
RE: Revised RPAC Letter

Eric,  
Thanks for giving us the opportunity to review EPA's revised letter.  
Matt is out today. We should be able to get back to you early next  
week.

Jim

-----Original Message-----

From: Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov  
[mailto:Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov]  
Sent: Friday, November 21, 2008 10:10 AM  
To: MCCLINCY Matt; LACEY David; ANDERSON Jim M  
Cc: Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov; Koch.Kristine@epamail.epa.gov  
Subject: Revised RPAC Letter

Attached is the revised RPAC letter. It goes to SLI. It references  
the discussions we had with SLI in 2007. Upon reflection, I believe we  
should use the GASCO model for this work. It seems to match the  
agreement we had in 2007 and the fact that the evaluation was sent to  
DEQ.

Please let me know your thoughts.

Thanks, Eric

(See attached file: RPACLetter112108.doc)